

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action dated July 18, 2006 contained a final rejection of claims 1-25. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 21. Claims 1-25 are in the case. Please consider the present amendment with the attached Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This amendment is in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Krsul et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,829,607).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Specifically, Krsul et al. merely disclose generating electronic monetary tokens that supports off-line transactions while preventing double-spending. Each electronic monetary token is split into two electronic token halves and each is associated with the same serial number. These electronic token halves when combined recreate the electronic monetary token from which they were generated, but by themselves neither electronic token half has any value (see Abstract and col. 5, lines 60-67 of Krsul et al.).

In contrast, the Applicants' newly independent claims now include creating an auditing record of the acquisition and shareholder identifications associated with the acquisition and auditing the acquisition if a legal investigation is requested to ensure legitimacy of the acquisition by reconstructing the auditing record for determining an identity of the entity. Support for the newly amended claims can be found throughout the specification and at least in FIGS. 3-7 and paragraphs [0009] and [0020] - [0021] of the Application specification (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046210).

Although Krsul et al. disclose that if "...bank 18 does not find a match, the seller is attempting to double spend the token, and bank 18 will not credit the seller for that electronic token," (see col. 11, lines 18-30), this is very different from the Applicants' auditing. Namely, Krsul et al. does not disclose the Applicants' claimed creating an auditing record of the acquisition and shareholder identifications associated with the acquisition and auditing the acquisition if a legal investigation is requested to ensure legitimacy of the acquisition by reconstructing the auditing record for determining an identity of the entity.

Serial No.: 09/944,739  
Attorney Docket No.: 10004408-1

Since Krsul et al. do not disclose the newly added claimed elements of the independent claims, Krsul et al. cannot anticipate the claims. Hence, the Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.


With regard to the rejection of the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly request the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: October 18, 2006



\_\_\_\_\_  
Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicants  
(818) 885-1575 TEL  
(818) 885-5750 FAX